

Appl No. 10/551500
Reply to Action dated 2/26/08
Page 8

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAY 27 2008

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and reexamination of this application.

Claims 2 and 13 have been amended. Claim 2 has been revised to an independent form including limitations of claim 16. Claims 2 and 13 are editorially revised. The term "whose" in claim 2 has been revised to "wherein." The phrase "the coercive force" in claim 13 has been revised to "a coercive force." Claims 1, 16, 28, and 35 have been cancelled without disclaimer or prejudice. There is no new matter. Claims 2-15, 17-27, 29-34, and 36-37 are pending.

Claim Objections

Claim 13 was objected because of insufficient antecedent basis for the claim limitation "the coercive force." This phrase has been revised to address this objection. Applicants respectfully request that the objection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

Claims 1-10, 14-16, 19-26, 28-30, and 32-37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Stephenson et al. (US 7110312). Applicants do not concede the correctness of the rejection.

Claims 1, 16, 28, and 35 have been cancelled making this rejection moot against them.

Claim 2 has been revised to an independent form including limitations of claim 16. The rejection stated that Stephenson et al. teaches all of the required limitations of claims 2 and 16. In particular the rejection stated that Stephenson et al. discloses a detecting element of a memory cell in Fig. 1, reference number 24 ("sensor," see column 3, line 64). Applicants respectfully disagree. The "sensor" taught in Stephenson et al. is not an analogous structure to the detecting element of claim 2. Stephenson et al. defines "sensor 24" to be a simple "Hall effect sensor" that is known in the art (see column 4, lines 6-35). Stephenson et al. does not even suggest that the "sensor 24" includes a second magnetic field generating part. Further, Stephenson et al. does not teach nor suggest that a change in electric output in a magnetoelectric converting part can be improved. Further, Stephenson et al. did not recognize the advantages of having a second magnetic field generating part to apply an offset magnetic field to the magnetoelectric converting part. In contrast, claim 2 requires a controlling part that comprises a first magnetic field

Appl No. 10/551500
Reply to Action dated 2/26/08
Page 9

generating part for applying a magnetic field to the magnetic device so as to change a magnetization state of the magnetic device, and a detecting element that comprises a second magnetic field generating part to apply an offset magnetic field to the magnetoelectric converting part arranged in the vicinity of the magnetic device. Accordingly, Stephenson et al. fails to teach at least this limitation. Therefore, Claim 2 is patentable over Stephenson et al. Claims 3-10, 14-15, 19-26, 29-30, 32-34, and 36-37 are patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 2 from which they depend. A favorable reexamination and reconsideration of the claims are requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

Claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stephenson et al. in view of Mizoguchi et al. (US 6903645). Mizoguchi et al. does not remedy the deficiencies of Stephenson et al. stated above in regard to claim 2. Claim 11 is patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 2 from which it depends. A favorable reexamination and reconsideration of the claim are requested.

Claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stephenson et al. in view of Ise et al. (US 5094925). Ise et al. does not remedy the deficiencies of Stephenson et al. stated above in regard to claim 2. Claim 12 is patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 2 from which it depends. A favorable reexamination and reconsideration of the claim are requested.

Claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stephenson et al. in view of Oshiki et al. (US 6392832). Oshiki et al. does not remedy the deficiencies of Stephenson et al. stated above in regard to claim 2. Claim 13 is patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 2 from which it depends. A favorable reexamination and reconsideration of the claim are requested.

Appl No. 10/551500
Reply to Action dated 2/26/08
Page 10

MAY 27 2008

In view of the above, early issuance of a notice of allowance is solicited. Any questions regarding this communication can be directed to the undersigned attorney, Curtis B. Hamre, Reg. 29,165, at (612) 455-3802.



Dated: May 27, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

HAMRE, SCHUMANN, MUELLER &
LARSON, P.C.
P.O. Box 2902
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0902
(612) 455-3800

By: *Curtis B. Hamre*
Curtis B. Hamre
Reg. No. 29,165
CBH/ajk